

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 2

Wednesday, October 3, 2012

Alumni Rooms, 3:00 p.m.

Presiding Officer: Bryan Vescio, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Clifford Abbott

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 1 September 12, 2012 [page 2]

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

4. OLD BUSINESS

- a. Honors Program (second reading) - Presented by Illene Cupit [page 7]
- b. General Education Reform (second reading) [page 9]

5. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Resolution on the Flexible Degree #1 - Presented by Derek Jeffreys [page 13]
- b. Resolution on the Flexible Degree #2 - Presented by Derek Jeffreys [page 13]
- c. Request for future business

6. PROVOST'S REPORT

7. OTHER REPORTS

- a. Academic Affairs Council Report [page 14]

8. ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES 2012-2013
UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 1

Wednesday, September 12, 2012

Alumni Room, University Union

Presiding Officer: Bryan Vescio, Speaker of the Senate

Parliamentarian: Clifford Abbott

PRESENT: Francis Akakpo (SOWORK), Kimberly Baker (HUB), Forrest Baulieu (ICS), Franklin Chen (NAS), Susan Cooper (EDUC alternate), Greg Davis (NAS-UC), Michael Draney (NAS), Heidi Fencil (NAS), Derek Jeffreys (HUS-UC), Mimi Kubsch (NUR-UC), Arthur Lacey (EDU), J. Vincent Lowery (HUS), Kaoime Malloy (Theatre and Dance), Christopher Martin (HUS), Ryan Martin (HUD-UC), Michelle McQuade-Dewhirst (MUS), Steve Meyer (NAS-UC), Jennifer Mokren (AND), Cristina Ortiz (HUS), Laurel Phoenix (PEA), Uwe Pott (HUB), Chuck Rybak (HUS), Mussie Teclezion (BUA), Christine Vandenhouten (NURS), Bryan Vescio (HUS-UC), Julia Wallace (Provost, *ex officio*), Jill White (HUD), Georjeanna Wilson-Doenges (HUD).

NOT PRESENT: Andrew Austin (DJS), Adolfo Garcia (ICS), Thomas Harden (Chancellor *ex officio*), Michael Knight (BUA), and Adam Parillo (URS)

REPRESENTATIVES: Heba Mohammad, Student Government; Kristi Aoki, Academic Staff

GUESTS: Sue Mattison, Scott Furlong, Lucy Arendt, Andrew Kersten, Steve VandenAvond, Illene Cupit, Donna Ritch, Leif Nelson, Catherine Henze, John Lyon, Kris Vespia, Paula Ganyard, and Mark Nook.

1. Call to Order. Speaker Vescio brought his first Senate meeting of the year to order at 3:02. He introduced the members of the University Committee and the representatives from the Academic Staff and Student Government. Then he urged the senators to engage and educate themselves about the issues before the Senate, to be cautious in exercising their right to abstain from voting, and to recall that they represent both their units and the Faculty as a whole.

2. Approval of Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting No. 10, May 2, 2012. Speaker Vescio asked for a motion to approve the previous minutes and from the engaged and educated body **Senator Ryan Martin moved (Senator Mokren second) to approve the minutes. Without discussion the motion passed with appropriately cautious use of abstentions (23-0-2).**

3. Chancellor's Report. The Chancellor being absent, his report was omitted.

4. New Business.

a. Election of Deputy Speaker of the Senate for 2012-13. In a display of spontaneity that probably fooled no one, **Senator Meyer nominated (Senator Jeffreys second) Senator Davis. There were no other nominations and the election was unanimous (25-0-0).**

b. General Education Reform (first reading). Speaker Vescio turned the gavel over to Deputy Speaker Davis in order to participate in the debate. Professor Arendt in tandem with Senator Vescio recapitulated the presentation before the Senate's Open Forum last May, q.v.. They reviewed the process (previous Senate action, Task Force deliberations, consultative interaction with units, and discussion at the Senate) and the basic rationale (greater coherence, connection to the mission and Senate-approved principles, narrative articulation, building on current strengths, and a cautious approach to resources through repurposing courses and not adding credits to the total requirement). The duo also explained the next steps (a second reading in October, a vote, and then the use of regular governance processes to repurpose and approve new courses). The senators had questions on the handling of transfer students (for those with up to 15 credits the first year seminars are optional), overlapping of major and general education capstone courses (allowable), distinctness of programs (defined by course prefixes), resources (Dean Furlong met with all unit leaders over summer), and the Senate's previous actions on first year seminars (these are different in defining constraints). Senators also registered objections that not enough of the fine arts, life sciences, technology, and quantitative competencies were being demanded of students. The Deputy Speaker encouraged consultation of Senators with their constituents in preparation for a vote at the second reading.

c. Honors Program (first reading) Speaker Vescio resumed his duties to introduce the indefatigable Professor Cupit to introduce the third revision of a proposal for an Honors Program. She reviewed the process that led to the proposal, distinguished an honors program from an honors college (the college approach separates honors students from others more), and noted that most of the budget was for faculty release time to direct and advise the program. Senators asked for more details (formal structure, relations to reformed general education, criteria for designating an honors course, relations to current honors in the major). For many of these the response was that the faculty needed to show support in order for the administration to invest so that the details could be worked out. In response to a question about how students would be chosen, Professor Cupit admired the UW-Madison program's use of application essays to determine motivation.

d. Requests for future business The Speaker made the standard request just slightly out of order to keep everyone on their toes.

5. Provost's Report. The Provost reported many things were up, including the number of new freshmen, the number of minority students among the new freshmen, the average high school grade point average of the new freshmen, the number of regular students taking on-line classes, and our *US News and World Report* rankings. Also up are three new people in the Provost's Office: Andy Kersten as Assistant Vice Chancellor, Angie Bauer as Special Assistant to the Provost, and Dan McCollum as Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Administration.

6. Other Reports.

a. Faculty Rep Report. Senator Meyer was willing to forego his report in the interest of saving time for the Open Forum. He made a **motion (Senator Jeffreys second) to legitimize this omission and it passed unanimously (24-0-0)**.

b. University Committee Report. University Committee Chair Derek Jeffreys similarly yielded his report in the interests of time.

c. Academic Staff Report. Kristi Aoki reported a change in leadership of the Academic Staff Committee (Kelley Kramp has left and Leif Nelson has taken her place as chair). She also reported that the Academic Staff Committee is pressing for representation on the System committee working on the Flexible Degree.

d. Student Government Report. Heba Mohammad had time just to mention that two continuing items on the agenda of student government: the development of the multi-purpose space between the Union and housing, and the interest in providing better child care options on campus.

7. Open Forum on ~~General Education Reform~~ Flexible Degree Proposal

Speaker Vescio called on UC Chair Jeffreys to introduce both the topic (the proposal for a Flexible Degree program) and a guest (UW System Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs Mark Nook). He did so by articulating several concerns about the process of developing the proposal (asking for faculty representatives on a System committee when faculty were generally unavailable over the summer, being unclear about the charge to the committee, expecting the development of competency based exams, being unclear about the relation of the development committee and regular faculty governance, and the quickness of an implementation date) and about the concept of the proposal (the presumption between education exists just to serve workforce needs).

VP Nook admitted some awkwardness about how the proposal (at this point really just an intent-to-plan) had been announced and then he presented some background. There are 700,000 citizens of Wisconsin with some college experience but no degree. There are 17,000 enrolled in for-profit schools and these people are paying more for something other than UW quality presumably because they are not being served by UW. Recognizing the market and the need for a better educated citizenry in Wisconsin, the Governor was interested in inviting Western Governors University into Wisconsin when the Chancellor of Extension and the President of the UW System asked for the opportunity to develop a UW response with the expectation that it could be delivered less expensively and with UW quality. Nook posed the question of why this should be taken seriously and noted two important changes in higher education in recent decades: the rise of educational assessment in accountability and improvement (learning outcomes are close to competencies); and advances in technology that now have the potential to make on-line education a richer experience than in the past. He noted we are already taking advantage of these changes, e.g. in the BSN completion program.

He then outlined the charge to the UW System committee being formed (they'd like a rep from UWGB identified by Sept. 21 now): to articulate relevant questions; to coordinate the design of a model; to oversee definitions in how to develop competencies; and to work with interested programs to make sure shared goals are being met.

He then wanted to correct some common misunderstandings: UW-Extension does not have degree-granting authority and will not grant degrees; on-line degrees will not necessarily be cheaper (either in the sense of cost or value). With that background he invited questions from the Senate. He got about half a dozen before the Speaker noticed it was just minutes before 5:00 and called for a motion to extend the meeting. **Senator Jeffreys moved (Senator Ortiz second) to suspend the rules to extend the meeting**

indefinitely and this passed (17-4-2). The meeting continued with dwindling attendance for another 50 minutes, eventually under the Deputy Speaker when the Speaker had to run off to class. [Hint: if a senator wishes a meeting to end, one parliamentary procedure is to make a quorum call. Action then stops to ascertain a quorum. If there is no quorum, the meeting then adjourns. In the absence of a quorum call, the meeting continues.]

A few senators in the forum offered positions on aspects of the flexible degree (there should be no increased workload on faculty; Flexible Degrees should be distinctively labeled; governance needs to be involved; real learning cannot be reduced to competencies; faculty should have a bigger voice in planning; assessment of prior learning is a lot of work) but most grilled VP Nook with questions such as:

How can a System committee of reps set the competencies? - It shouldn't; it should decide how to set competencies.

Is the informational material seen so far on the Flexible Degree set in stone? - No, there is just an intent-to-plan at this point.

If the UW is already doing some aspects of the Flexible Degree, why aren't the 17,000 coming to us? - The for-profits do more marketing.

Why do this through Extension, given its past record? - Extension cannot offer the degrees, contrary to the Governor's wishes, but it can provide a centralized infrastructure for things such as registration, advising, and financial aid.

Does Extension do assessment? - No.

How patient is the Governor in seeing implementation? - He wants it in place now, but you may have to worry more about certain regents than the Governor. It'd be nice to have one program in place next fall.

Why not expand programs like our Interdisciplinary Studies Program to serve the 17,000? - That's course-based. Think in terms of competencies instead of courses.

Won't Flexible Degree programs compete with current programs? - Not necessarily, but for some students the flexibility will outweigh the advantages of a residential experience.

Who defines the competencies? - The campuses control the degrees. UW System cannot do that beyond specifying process and some minimum shared learning outcomes.

What would we lose by not participating in the Flexible Degree? - Faculty need to become aware of risks and returns. Non-participants may lose out on important new revenue sources.

Is service to the 17,000 a temporary or continuing need? - Check your sense of the changing economy and the need for a better educated workforce.

Aren't self-paced modules without cohort interaction a poorer model of education? - They probably won't be self-paced, but again think in terms of competencies instead of courses.

How do we equate competencies with credit hours? - We may have to leave credit hours behind and define degrees in terms of competencies instead of credit hours.

Who controls after the competencies are initially defined? - That needs to be answered by the System planning committee.

Competencies sound like merit badges - what keeps competencies from becoming a C-level checklist? - The faculty get to set the competencies at whatever level they find appropriate.

How will we know graduates have the competencies? - How do you know now? The Flexible Degree programs could challenge current programs in that respect.

Do we really want to get in a race with the non-profits? - We need to focus on our responsibilities in educating the citizens of Wisconsin.

8. Adjournment. At 5:50 p.m. the discussion and attendance seemed expended so **Senator Meyer moved (Senator Rybak second) to adjourn and it happened.**

Respectfully submitted by Clifford Abbott
Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

UW-GB Honors Program
Revised program – “University Scholars”

Mission Statement: The University Scholars Program mission is to:

- enhance the learning environment for students at the University of Wisconsin – Green Bay by offering qualified applicants opportunities for advanced academic pursuits,
- foster an intellectually engaged community of students, staff, and faculty,
- seek students who desire to be active learners, pursue independent intellectual interests and who want to expand their leadership and service capacity beyond the classroom,
- promote a cohesive education that challenges students, more deeply cultivates their interdisciplinary thought and helps them to achieve skills that can be applied in new ways to address real world problems and issues. Students are further encouraged to expand their leadership abilities, increase their involvement in the campus through internships and research, enroll in study abroad programs, and participate in a variety of programs in the community,
- individualize and coordinate these learning opportunities for participating students, and
- enhance the overall quality of the student experience on campus as well as provide opportunities in each student’s professional and personal life.
- Create innovative learning experiences that may also be applied to students who do not participate in an Honors Program.

Components of the Program:

- First Year Seminar
- General Education course (one/semester for first two years)
- Service Learning group project/course
- Interdisciplinary Honors minor
- Honors project
- Senior capstone seminar
- Travel course (optional)

Program beginnings:

Fall 2012:

- Director named, one course release to begin planning and development
- Near the end of Fall 2012 semester, Director works with First Year Seminar instructors to compile list of students to form a University Scholars Student Advisory committee to help develop the program in the spring semester
- University Scholars Student Advisory committee members would become the Inaugural Class of University Scholars, starting in Spring 2013
- Director begins planning and preparations for recruiting second cohort; prepares mailings.

Spring 2013:

- Special section of Gen Ed for Inaugural University Scholars; course buyout to replace one Gen Ed section reserved for University Scholars
- Director, one course release; begins intensive recruitment of second cohort; advises first cohort; continues developing program; plans special June orientation for University Scholars

Expected program plan and basic budget:

Year one (2012-2013)

- Director 2 course buyout (one course per semester) (\$12,000 salary + fringe)
- Gen Ed backfill spring 2013 (\$6,000 salary + fringe)

Year two (2013-2014)

- Director 2 course buyout (\$12,000 salary + fringe)
- Gen Ed 2 course backfill (\$12,000 salary + fringe)
- First Year Seminar (no buyout required; already small sections)

Year three (2014-2015)

- Director 4 course buyout, to include developing and advising student service learning course (\$24,000 salary + fringe)
- Gen Ed 2 course backfill (\$12,000 salary + fringe)
- First Year Seminar (no buyout required)

Year four and each year thereafter (2015-)

- Director 4 course buyout; to include service learning course and capstone experience (\$24,000 salary + fringe)
- Gen Ed 2 course backfill (\$12,000 salary + fringe)
- First Year Seminar (no buyout required)
- Capstone experience (above)

Additional expenses:

NCHC conference travel every other year (\$4,000)

Wisconsin conference travel every other year (\$2,000)

S&E (\$500)

Total expenses:

Year one: \$20,500

Year two: \$28,500

Year three: \$38,500

Year four and thereafter: \$38,500 - \$40,000

When budget is no longer an issue, reconfigure program to become a full-fledged Honors Program.

Faculty Senate Old Business 4a 10/3/2012

Resolution on General Education Reform

Resolved: The Faculty Senate supports the model of general education in the following materials (presented at an Open Forum at the Senate's May 2, 2012 meeting) with a target implementation date of fall 2014.

Goals of the General Education Task Force

At the end of the spring semester (2011), the Task Force agreed on a working model that would be used to discuss with the faculty in all of the interdisciplinary units during the fall semester (2011). As approved by the General Education Council and the Faculty Senate, the Task Force has proceeded in its discussions and development based the following purpose and mission statement.

General Education Purpose and Mission

The UWGB General Education Program supports the University's Select Mission by providing an interdisciplinary, problem-focused educational experience that prepares students to think critically and address complex issues in a multicultural and evolving world.

To that end, the UWGB General Education Program will help to develop liberally educated students and facilitate their living in an ever changing world by:

1. Introducing students to interdisciplinary education;
 - This goal relates most directly to the primary mission of UWGB and ensures that students have an introduction to interdisciplinarity and its importance early in their career.
2. Providing knowledge that includes disciplinary breadth;
 - Students must have adequate breadth of knowledge and course work that is representative of distinct ways of thinking.
3. Working with students to develop an understanding of critical social problems;
 - In order to have an appropriate understanding of problems and issues (e.g., sustainability) regardless of their eventual major, students must have background and/or a variety of experiences from global and multicultural perspectives. In addition, UWGB's select mission recognizes the importance of a university education to promote engaged citizens. The General Education program will help foster these elements of a student's education.
4. Supporting the development of important academic skills including communication, critical thinking, problem solving, and quantitative and information literacy.
 - Certain skills are critical for any liberally educated individual in order to promote life-long learning and understand the complexity of the issues and problems of our world.

Based on the above direction, research, and discussions, the Task Force developed its draft model that was discussed at the unit meetings (see Appendix A).

Advantages of the Draft Model

The Task Force sees this model as providing a number of advantages for our General Education program:

1. General Education should be reflective of our mission. What we're proposing does that, in accordance with what the Faculty Senate approved.
2. General Education should be distinctive to Green Bay. It needs to reflect what we do well. This proposal takes into account UWGB's distinctive competencies (e.g., focus on interdisciplinarity, problem-solving, and sustainability).
3. The proposed General Education better enables integration with the rest of the curriculum.
4. Conversations in higher education across the country argue for making college in general, and General Education in particular, more relevant to society. This proposal includes a focus on complex societal issues that require an informed citizenry to resolve.
5. The number of credits associated with this proposal is approximately the same as the existing number of required Gen Ed credits.
6. This proposal offers faculty members needed flexibility, in terms of courses to be taught and the categories in which they fit.
7. The proposed program is simpler to understand and explain than the current Gen Ed program.
8. The proposed program is a coherent package, with a beginning (first year seminar) and an end (capstone seminar or experience), and clearly delineated and understandable elements in between. It will be easier to explain our General Education program to incoming freshmen and their parents. The program starts with an interdisciplinary seminar that introduces students to UWGB's distinctive academic plan. In order to fully develop their capacity to engage in interdisciplinary problem-solving, students are next introduced to breadth in the disciplines. Then, students are asked to examine complex, societal issues from several perspectives (global, ethnic, sustainability). Throughout the Gen Ed program, students build the technical and personal skills needed to succeed in their advanced courses and careers. Finally, students complete a capstone seminar or capstone experience that integrates their Gen Ed and advanced courses into a cohesive whole.
9. This is a draft framework. The details about specific courses will be determined at the unit, domain, and governance levels.

Next Steps

The General education Task Force presented the framework to the Faculty Senate at its May 2012 meeting with an expectation of a vote this fall. The Task Force will continue to take feedback and consider changes. The Task Force has been working with the unit chairs on modeling resource implications. Governance will vote on the framework, and then considerable dialogue will ensue engaging all relevant parties in the discussion of details. The Task Force will not decide which courses fit where. That will be a mutual decision of units and the General Education Council, consistent with our code and practice.

General Education Task Force
Working Model

Gen Ed Element	Credits	Comments
First Year Seminar	3	The First Year Seminar would introduce interdisciplinarity and include other skill elements
Capstone Seminar or Experience	3	The upper level Seminar could be related to the major program; and other ways to meet this requirement such as honors project, internship, practicum, etc.
BREADTH		
The assumption is that these classes would be large in order to enable the smaller enrollments associated with the seminar and perspectives courses.		
Science Requirement	6	Minimum two courses from different programs
Social Science Requirement	6	Minimum two courses from different programs
Humanities Requirement	6	Minimum two courses from different programs
Fine Arts Requirement	3	One three credit course or accepted performance based courses (total = 3 credits)
PERSPECTIVES REQUIREMENTS		
The assumption is that these courses would have 40 students each. There will be some amount of writing associated with these classes.		
Global Perspectives	3	Minimum one course whose focus is primarily on issues outside of the US or a travel course experience or foreign language at the 225 level or above
Ethnic Studies Perspectives	3	Similar to what we do now
Sustainability Perspectives	3	Select one of a variety of existing courses such as: Intro to Env Science, Env and Society, Energy and Society, Sustainable Development, Business and its Environment
Quantitative Competency	3	Could do this through a series of courses such as Math 104 (or testing out at this level) and above, any stats course, accounting, logic
Other skills (critical thinking, written/oral communication, problem solving, information literacy) will not have specific credits dedicated to them. Rather, they will be incorporated into the above classes—although not necessarily all skill in all courses.		
Total Credits	39	

Incorporating Skills into General Education

In order to support UW-Green Bay's General Education Purpose and Mission statement particularly the following point (4) where the "General Education program will help to develop liberally educated students and facilitate their living in an ever changing world by:

Supporting the development of important academic skills including communication, critical thinking, problem solving, quantitative literacy and information literacy,"

The General Education Task Force is recommending that courses within the General Education curriculum incorporate certain skills that are appropriate for the category of classes in which the course falls within the General Education curriculum.

<u>GENERAL ED CATEGORY</u>	<u>LEARNING OBJECTIVES/SKILLS</u>
First Year Seminar	Interdisciplinarity Communication Information Literacy
Capstone Seminar/Experience	Interdisciplinarity Problem-focused Communication
Breadth	
Science	
Social Science	
Humanities	
Fine Arts	
	
	Information Literacy in the context of the content
Global Perspectives	
Ethnic Studies Perspectives	
Sustainability Perspectives	
	
	Critical Thinking Communication

Points to Consider:

- These represent the minimum skill elements for the courses. Faculty can choose to do more if they wish.
- In most cases it is not the role of General Education to ensure mastery of these skills. It is to introduce and then build upon the introduction

Faculty Senate Old Business 4b 10/3/2012

**Resolutions on the UW Flexible Degree Proposal
University of Wisconsin, Green Bay Faculty Senate
October 3, 2012**

Resolution #1

Whereas the UWGB faculty has concerns about the process by which the Flexible Degree program is being implemented; and

Whereas the UWGB faculty doubts that the Flexible degree program will meet the academic standards of a university education; and

Whereas the UWGB faculty holds that a college experience is important; therefore be it

Resolved that the University of Wisconsin, Green Bay Faculty Senate disapproves of the University of Wisconsin System proposal to establish a Flexible Degree.

Faculty Senate New Business 5a 10/3/2012

Resolution #2

Whereas a member of the UW Flexible Degree Committee would help gauge how or whether UWGB should be involved in the Flexible Degree Program; and

Whereas the Flexible Degree Committee would provide input to help formulate the Flexible Degree; therefore be it

Resolved that the University of Wisconsin, Green Bay Faculty Senate recommends that the University Committee appoint a representative to the Flexible Degree Committee.

Faculty Senate New Business 5b 10/3/2012

Academic Affairs Council - Summary of Curriculum Actions – September 2012

- Approved CPS60 Form AA Business Administration - Accounting Major - delete B384 and B386 from the list of electives. Rationale: Courses are inactive.
- Approved CLAS 139 Form AA Humanistic Studies – History Major and Minor - Remove HUS 337 (Age of Reason) from the Category II list for the history major and minor. Rationale: The Age of Reason is no longer taught exclusively by a historian, the faculty voted unanimously to remove it from the Category II list of requirements for the major [and minor].

Respectfully submitted,
Kaoime E. Malloy
Chair, AAC